# The complete Brans-Dicke theory

Georgios Kofinas[1,*]

[1]*Research Group of Geometry, Dynamical Systems and Cosmology*
*Department of Information and Communication Systems Engineering*
*University of the Aegean, Karlovassi 83200, Samos, Greece*

The most general completion of Brans-Dicke gravity is found with energy exchanged in a uniquely defined way between the scalar field and ordinary matter, given that the simple wave equation of Brans-Dicke for the scalar field is preserved. The theory contains a new parameter (integration constant from the integration procedure) and when this is switched off, Brans-Dicke theory emerges. As usually, the vacuum theory can be defined from the complete Brans-Dicke theory when the matter energy-momentum tensor vanishes. However, additionally, the complete family of vacuum theories is found, consistent with the free wave equation for the scalar field. The subclass of this family with identically covariantly conserved energy-momentum tensor is identified and, thus, can be supplemented by any equation of motion for the scalar field.

arXiv:1510.06845v3 [gr-qc] 16 Dec 2015

## I. INTRODUCTION

Brans-Dicke gravity theory introduces an additional long-range scalar field $\phi$ besides the metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$ of spacetime and is considered a viable alternative to General Relativity, one which respects Mach's principle. The effective gravitational constant $G$ is proportional to the inverse of the scalar field. The scalar field does not exert any direct influence on matter, its only role is that of participating in the field equations that determine the geometry of the spacetime. In the following, we will present the uniquely defined generalization of Brans-Dicke theory withdrawing this constraint.

## II. THE COMPLETE THEORY WITH $\Box\phi = 4\pi\lambda\mathcal{T}$

The following system of equations in four spacetime dimensions for the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$, the scalar field $\phi$, and the rest energy-momentum tensor $\mathcal{T}^{\mu}_{\ \nu}$ (e.g. the standard matter-radiation in the case of cosmology)

$$G^{\mu}_{\ \nu}=\frac{8\pi}{\phi}(T^{\mu}_{\ \nu}+\mathcal{T}^{\mu}_{\ \nu}) \tag{2.1}$$

$$T^{\mu}_{\ \nu}=\frac{\phi}{2\lambda(\nu+8\pi\phi^2)^2}\Big\{2\big[(1+\lambda)\nu+4\pi(2-3\lambda)\phi^2\big]\phi^{;\mu}\phi_{;\nu}-\big[(1+2\lambda)\nu+4\pi(2-3\lambda)\phi^2\big]\delta^{\mu}_{\ \nu}\phi^{;\rho}\phi_{;\rho}\Big\}+\frac{\phi^2}{\nu+8\pi\phi^2}\big(\phi^{;\mu}_{\ \ ;\nu}-\delta^{\mu}_{\ \nu}\Box\phi\big) \tag{2.2}$$

$$\Box\phi=4\pi\lambda\mathcal{T} \tag{2.3}$$

$$\mathcal{T}^{\mu}_{\ \nu;\mu}=\frac{\nu}{\phi(\nu+8\pi\phi^2)}\mathcal{T}^{\mu}_{\ \nu}\phi_{;\mu}\,, \tag{2.4}$$

where $\nu$ is an arbitrary parameter with dimensions mass to the fourth (it actually arises as an integration constant from the integration procedure), $\lambda\neq 0$ is the standard Brans-Dicke dimensionless parameter and $\mathcal{T}=\mathcal{T}^{\mu}_{\ \mu}$, has the following properties:
(i) the right hand side of equation (2.1) is consistent with the Bianchi identities, i.e. it is covariantly conserved on-shell, and therefore the system (2.1)-(2.4) is well-defined.
(ii) for $\nu=0$ it reduces to the standard Brans-Dicke theory [1] (in units with $c=1$)

$$G^{\mu}_{\ \nu}=\frac{8\pi}{\phi}(T^{\mu}_{\ \nu}+\mathcal{T}^{\mu}_{\ \nu}) \tag{2.5}$$

$$T^{\mu}_{\ \nu}=\frac{2-3\lambda}{16\pi\lambda\phi}\Big(\phi^{;\mu}\phi_{;\nu}-\frac{1}{2}\delta^{\mu}_{\ \nu}\phi^{;\rho}\phi_{;\rho}\Big)+\frac{1}{8\pi}\big(\phi^{;\mu}_{\ \ ;\nu}-\delta^{\mu}_{\ \nu}\Box\phi\big) \tag{2.6}$$

*Electronic address: gkofinas@aegean.gr

$$\Box\phi = 4\pi\lambda\mathcal{T} \tag{2.7}$$

$$\mathcal{T}^{\mu}{}_{\nu;\mu} = 0\,. \tag{2.8}$$

(iii) given that $T^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$ is constructed from terms each of which involves two derivatives of one or two $\phi$ fields, and $\phi$ itself, and given the equation (2.3), the system (2.1)-(2.4) is the only Einstein-like theory which can be constructed. Therefore, it can be called as the complete Brans-Dicke gravity theory.

It is obvious that the previous generalization of Brans-Dicke theory is possible because $\mathcal{T}^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$ is no longer strictly conserved, but the conservation law (2.4) holds (for other approaches with modified equations of motion see [2], [3]). The matter couples directly to $\phi$; for example in cosmology interacting fluids are currently studied extensively [4], however, usually the interaction chosen is ad-hoc and does not arise by any physical theory. Since in the action of Brans-Dicke gravity the scalar field is non-minimally coupled to the curvature, the same mechanism could also lead to a coupling between the scalar and matter fields, as happens here. Various studies have analyzed the exchange of energy from ordered motion by entropy generation due to bulk viscosity, direct decay or non-adiabatic processes from a scalar field [5, 6]. For example, in [3] a modified wave equation for $\phi$ was considered in Brans-Dicke theory, which therefore does not fall into our consideration. Of course, the parameters $\lambda, \nu$ should be such that the equivalence principle is not violated at the ranges that it has been tested (equivalence principle becomes fragile also in Brans-Dicke theory against quantum effects [7]). Chameleon mechanism [8] may contribute to this direction, since the effective mass of $\phi$ can become density dependent, so a large effective mass may be acquired in solar scale hiding local experiments, while at cosmological scales $\phi$ can be effectively light providing cosmological modifications. An alternative for the recovery of General Relativity in the regions of high energy is the introduction of non-linear self interactions for $\phi$ through self screening (Vainshtein) mechanisms [9]. Since the validity of the universality of free fall at cosmological scales has not been tested directly, another option is that the portion of baryonic matter inside $\mathcal{T}^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$ is separately conserved, while the dark matter of cosmology obeys the non-conservation law (2.4) with the total $\mathcal{T}^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$ on the right hand sides of (2.1), (2.3), (2.4). Note that the strength of the interaction in (2.3) is controlled by $\lambda$, while in (2.4) by $\nu$. Equation (2.4) is also written as $(\phi^{-1}\sqrt{|\nu+8\pi\phi^2|}\,\mathcal{T}^{\mu}{}_{\nu})_{;\mu} = 0$, while the conservation equation of $T^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$ comes from the combination of (2.1), (2.4) to be $T^{\mu}{}_{\nu;\mu} = (T^{\mu}{}_{\nu} + \frac{8\pi\phi^2}{\nu+8\pi\phi^2}\mathcal{T}^{\mu}{}_{\nu})\frac{\phi_{;\mu}}{\phi}$. Of course, in view of the Bianchi identities, equation (2.4) can be derived from (2.1)-(2.3). Moreover, we will see in section III that with only $\phi$ (no extra matter other than $\phi$), there exist infinite generalizations of vacuum Brans-Dicke gravity.

The Brans-Dicke theory can also be formulated in terms of an action solely based on dimensional arguments, with the matter Lagrangian being minimally coupled. However, if interactions of the matter Lagrangian with the scalar field are allowed, then plenty of actions could be constructed with limit the Brans-Dicke action in the absence of interactions. The number of such actions becomes even larger in the presence of Newton's constant $G_N$ or a new mass scale like $\nu$. On the opposite, the derivation of the interacting theory through the equations of motion provides a uniqueness prescription. Of course, a natural question which arises is what is the action, if any, which gives the system (2.1)-(2.4).

In the decoupling limit $\lambda \to 0$ of $\mathcal{T}^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$ and $\phi$, it is expected that Brans-Dicke theory goes over to the Einstein theory. However, in this limit equation (2.6) formally does not make sense; moreover in this limit, a solution of the system (2.5)-(2.8) does not always reduce to a solution of General Relativity with the same $\mathcal{T}^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$ [10]. On the other hand, the full equation (2.2) is meaningful in this limit, since redefining the integration constant $\nu$, e.g. as $\nu = \lambda^{-2}\nu'$, we get from (2.1)-(2.4) respectively $G^{\mu}{}_{\nu} = 8\pi\phi^{-1}\mathcal{T}^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$, $T^{\mu}{}_{\nu} \equiv 0$, $\Box\phi = 0$, $(\phi^{-1}\mathcal{T}^{\mu}{}_{\nu})_{;\mu} = 0$, which is Einstein-like gravity with a well-defined varying gravitational constant $G \sim \phi^{-1}$ (the constant $\phi$ solution can be further picked up to get Einstein gravity).

*Proof of the statements.* To prove the previous statements we start with the Bianchi identities

$$G^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\phi_{;\mu} - 8\pi T^{\mu}{}_{\nu;\mu} = 8\pi\mathcal{T}^{\mu}{}_{\nu;\mu} \tag{2.9}$$

arising from (2.1) , which are also written as

$$T^{\mu}{}_{\nu;\mu} - \frac{1}{\phi}T^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\phi_{;\mu} = \frac{1}{\phi}\mathcal{T}^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\phi_{;\mu} - \mathcal{T}^{\mu}{}_{\nu;\mu}\,. \tag{2.10}$$

The most general symmetric tensor that can be built up from terms each of which involves two derivatives of one or two $\phi$ fields, and $\phi$ itself, is

$$T^{\mu}{}_{\nu} = A(\phi)\phi^{;\mu}\phi_{;\nu} + B(\phi)\delta^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\phi^{;\rho}\phi_{;\rho} + C(\phi)\phi^{;\mu}{}_{;\nu} + E(\phi)\delta^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\Box\phi\,. \tag{2.11}$$

Using the Einstein equation (2.1), the form of $T^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$ from (2.11), and the identity $R^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\phi_{;\mu} = \Box(\phi_{;\nu}) - (\Box\phi)_{;\nu}$ , we express $\Box(\phi_{;\nu})$ as

$$\Box(\phi_{;\nu}) = (\Box\phi)_{;\nu} + \frac{4\pi}{\phi}(A-2B)\phi^{;\mu}\phi_{;\mu}\phi_{;\nu} - \frac{4\pi}{\phi}(C+2E)\phi_{;\nu}\Box\phi + \frac{8\pi}{\phi}C\phi^{;\mu}{}_{;\nu}\phi_{;\mu} + \frac{4\pi}{\phi}(2\mathcal{T}^{\mu}{}_{\nu} - \mathcal{T}\delta^{\mu}{}_{\nu})\phi_{;\mu}\,. \tag{2.12}$$

The Bianchi identities (2.10), differentiating $T^{\mu}_{\ \nu}$ from (2.11) and using (2.12), become

$$\Big[A'+B'+\frac{4\pi}{\phi}C(A-2B)-\frac{1}{\phi}(A+B)\Big]\phi^{;\mu}\phi_{;\mu}\phi_{;\nu}+\Big[A+E'-\frac{4\pi}{\phi}C(C+2E)-\frac{1}{\phi}E\Big]\phi_{;\nu}\Box\phi$$
$$+\Big[A+2B+C'+\frac{8\pi}{\phi}C^2-\frac{1}{\phi}C\Big]\phi^{;\mu}_{\ ;\nu}\phi_{;\mu}+(C+E)(\Box\phi)_{;\nu}+\Big(\mathcal{T}^{\mu}_{\ \nu;\mu}-\frac{1-8\pi C}{\phi}\mathcal{T}^{\mu}_{\ \nu}\phi_{;\mu}-\frac{4\pi}{\phi}C\mathcal{T}\phi_{;\nu}\Big)=0\,, \tag{2.13}$$

where a prime denotes differentiation with respect to $\phi$. Now, replacing $\mathcal{T}$ from (2.3) in (2.13) we get the Bianchi identities in the form

$$\Big[A'+B'+\frac{4\pi}{\phi}C(A-2B)-\frac{1}{\phi}(A+B)\Big]\phi^{;\mu}\phi_{;\mu}\phi_{;\nu}+\Big[A+E'-\frac{4\pi}{\phi}C(C+2E)-\frac{1}{\phi}E-\frac{1}{\lambda\phi}C\Big]\phi_{;\nu}\Box\phi$$
$$+\Big[A+2B+C'+\frac{8\pi}{\phi}C^2-\frac{1}{\phi}C\Big]\phi^{;\mu}_{\ ;\nu}\phi_{;\mu}+(C+E)(\Box\phi)_{;\nu}+\Big(\mathcal{T}^{\mu}_{\ \nu;\mu}-\frac{1-8\pi C}{\phi}\mathcal{T}^{\mu}_{\ \nu}\phi_{;\mu}\Big)=0\,. \tag{2.14}$$

Sufficient, but also necessary, condition for the satisfaction of (2.14) is the satisfaction of the following system of differential equations

$$A'+B'+\frac{4\pi}{\phi}C(A-2B)-\frac{1}{\phi}(A+B)=0 \tag{2.15}$$
$$A+E'-\frac{4\pi}{\phi}C(C+2E)-\frac{1}{\phi}E-\frac{1}{\lambda\phi}C=0 \tag{2.16}$$
$$A+2B+C'+\frac{8\pi}{\phi}C^2-\frac{1}{\phi}C=0 \tag{2.17}$$
$$C+E=0 \tag{2.18}$$
$$\mathcal{T}^{\mu}_{\ \nu;\mu}=\frac{1-8\pi C}{\phi}\mathcal{T}^{\mu}_{\ \nu}\phi_{;\mu}\,. \tag{2.19}$$

There is no question about the sufficiency of the above system of equations, but someone could doubt about its necessity. The necessity arises due to that in the limit $\mathcal{T}^{\mu}_{\ \nu}\to 0$, the system should still be meaningful. Indeed, as an alternative, if together with the two $\mathcal{T}^{\mu}_{\ \nu}$ terms in (2.19) some other terms of (2.14) were also added, then in the limit $\mathcal{T}^{\mu}_{\ \nu}\to 0$, either the new system of equations would be overdetermined or would give again (2.15)-(2.18). Due to these equations, the Bianchi identities (2.14) are identically satisfied, so they do not provide a new equation of motion.
The general solution of the system (2.15)-(2.18) will be now found. Using (2.18) and replacing (2.17) with the sum of (2.17) and (2.16), we obtain the equivalent system

$$(A+B)'+\frac{4\pi}{\phi}C(A-2B)-\frac{1}{\phi}(A+B)=0 \tag{2.20}$$
$$C'-A-\frac{4\pi}{\phi}C^2-\Big(1-\frac{1}{\lambda}\Big)\frac{1}{\phi}C=0 \tag{2.21}$$
$$A+B+\frac{6\pi}{\phi}C^2-\frac{1}{2\lambda\phi}C=0 \tag{2.22}$$
$$E=-C\,. \tag{2.23}$$

Defining the quantities $X=A+B$, $Y=A-B$, the system (2.20)-(2.23) gets the form

$$X'+\frac{2\pi}{\phi}C(3Y-X)-\frac{1}{\phi}X=0 \tag{2.24}$$
$$Y=2C'-\frac{8\pi}{\phi}C^2-2\Big(1-\frac{1}{\lambda}\Big)\frac{1}{\phi}C-X \tag{2.25}$$
$$X=-\frac{6\pi}{\phi}C^2+\frac{1}{2\lambda\phi}C \tag{2.26}$$
$$E=-C\,. \tag{2.27}$$

Differentiating (2.26) and replacing this derivative, as well as $X$ itself and $Y$ from (2.25), into (2.24), we get instead of (2.24) the following simple differential equation for $C$

$$C'+\frac{16\pi}{\phi}C^2-\frac{2}{\phi}C=0\,. \tag{2.28}$$

The general solution of equation (2.28) is

$$C=\frac{\phi^2}{\nu+8\pi\phi^2}\,, \tag{2.29}$$

where $\nu$ is integration constant (appeared in (2.2), (2.4) as parameter). Substituting this $C$ into (2.27), (2.26), (2.25), we obtain $E, X, Y$ as functions of $\phi$, and then $A(\phi)$, $B(\phi)$ also arise. The result is the energy-momentum tensor appeared in (2.2). Finally, plugging $C$ into (2.19) we obtain equation (2.4) and the proof is complete. □

To compare with the standard derivation of Brans-Dicke gravity [11], there, the quantity $R^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\phi_{;\mu}$ of the Bianchi identities (2.9) is replaced by $\Box(\phi_{;\nu})-(\Box\phi)_{;\nu}$, and after use of (2.11), (2.1), equation (2.9) becomes

$$\Big[A'+B'-\frac{1}{2\phi}(A+4B)\Big]\phi^{;\mu}\phi_{;\mu}\phi_{;\nu}+\Big[A+E'-\frac{1}{2\phi}(C+4E)\Big]\phi_{;\nu}\Box\phi+(A+2B+C')\phi^{;\mu}{}_{;\nu}\phi_{;\mu}$$
$$+\Big(E+\frac{1}{8\pi}\Big)(\Box\phi)_{;\nu}+\Big(C-\frac{1}{8\pi}\Big)\Box(\phi_{;\nu})+\Big(\mathcal{T}^{\mu}{}_{\nu;\mu}-\frac{1}{2\phi}\mathcal{T}\phi_{;\nu}\Big)=0\,. \tag{2.30}$$

Replacing $\mathcal{T}$ from (2.3), equation (2.30) becomes

$$\Big[A'+B'-\frac{1}{2\phi}(A+4B)\Big]\phi^{;\mu}\phi_{;\mu}\phi_{;\nu}+\Big[A+E'-\frac{1}{2\phi}(C+4E)-\frac{1}{8\pi\lambda\phi}\Big]\phi_{;\nu}\Box\phi+(A+2B+C')\phi^{;\mu}{}_{;\nu}\phi_{;\mu}$$
$$+\Big(E+\frac{1}{8\pi}\Big)(\Box\phi)_{;\nu}+\Big(C-\frac{1}{8\pi}\Big)\Box(\phi_{;\nu})+\mathcal{T}^{\mu}{}_{\nu;\mu}=0\,. \tag{2.31}$$

The main difference between equations (2.14) and (2.31) is that in (2.14) the quantity $\Box(\phi_{;\nu})$ has been expressed in terms of the quantity $(\Box\phi)_{;\nu}$, so these quantities are not independent, while in (2.31) both quantities are present and their coefficients vanish separately. This difference in the two approaches occurs not only here in the matter case, but also in section III of the vacuum case. Vanishing the various coefficients in (2.31) in order to satisfy the Bianchi identities, a system of (more) equations arise which is basically algebraic (the sole differential equation is identically satisfied) with solution the special theory (2.5)-(2.8) with no integration constant. On the contrary, the system of equations (2.15)-(2.19) is weaker (fewer equations) and purely differential, so its solution becomes more enlarged.

Note that a different than (2.3) equation of motion for the field $\phi$ would give a different theory. For example, for $\Box\phi+F(\phi)\phi^{;\mu}\phi_{;\mu}=4\pi\lambda\mathcal{T}$, the coefficient of $\phi^{;\mu}\phi_{;\mu}\phi_{;\nu}$ in (2.14) would be different. The interesting case with $\Box\phi=V'(\phi)+4\pi\lambda\mathcal{T}$ would leave equations (2.1), (2.2) unchanged, while on the right hand side of (2.4) the term $-\frac{\phi}{\nu+8\pi\phi^2}\frac{V'}{\lambda}\phi_{;\nu}$ should be added; in the absence of matter, $V$ should be just a cosmological constant (alternatively, a self-interacting potential could be introduced through an action with different results).

## III. GENERALIZED VACUUM BRANS-DICKE THEORIES

It is a standard issue in Brans-Dicke gravity (2.5)-(2.8) that the vacuum theory arises by vanishing the matter energy-momentum tensor $\mathcal{T}^{\mu}{}_{\nu}=0$ (for vacuum solutions see [1, 12, 13]). This means that the scalar field equation of motion is the free equation $\Box\phi=0$, together with the Einstein equation (2.5), (2.6). In this system there still appears the parameter $\lambda$ which now does not control any coupling, as was happening in equation (2.7) of the matter theory. However, there is a continuity between the purely vacuum theory (setting $\mathcal{T}^{\mu}{}_{\nu}=0$ from the beginning) and the vacuum theory which arises as the above limiting process of the matter theory. Indeed, the consistency of equation (2.30) with $\mathcal{T}^{\mu}{}_{\nu}=0$, $\Box\phi=0$, gives a system of three vanishing coefficients whose integration provides $T^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$ of (2.6) with the difference that now $\lambda$ is an integration constant.

The complete Brans-Dicke theory (2.1)-(2.4) of the previous section in the presence of extra matter, already defines for $\mathcal{T}^{\mu}{}_{\nu}=0$ a generalized vacuum Brans-Dicke theory (setting $\nu=0$ it reduces to the vacuum Brans-Dicke theory). However, it will be seen that this generalized vacuum Brans-Dicke theory is not the most general vacuum theory respecting the wave equation $\Box\phi=0$ and the standard assumption for $T^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$ being a sum of terms with two derivatives. So, the vacuum theory is not exhausted by setting $\mathcal{T}^{\mu}{}_{\nu}=0$ in the matter system (2.1)-(2.4), but there are infinitely many vacuum theories. This cannot be seen, as we explained, from equation (2.30). However, it can be seen from equation (2.13), where the vanishing of the remaining two coefficients of $\phi^{;\mu}\phi_{;\mu}\phi_{;\nu}$, $\phi^{;\mu}{}_{;\nu}\phi_{;\mu}$ defines the following system of equations

$$A'+B'+\frac{4\pi}{\phi}C(A-2B)-\frac{1}{\phi}(A+B)=0 \tag{3.1}$$

$$C'+\frac{8\pi}{\phi}C^2-\frac{1}{\phi}C+A+2B=0\,. \tag{3.2}$$

The solution of equations (3.1), (3.2) in principle contains one arbitrary function of $\phi$ and integration constants. Any $T^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$ satisfying (3.1), (3.2) defines a consistent vacuum Einstein system with equation of motion for the scalar field $\Box\phi = 0$, so it defines the complete vacuum Brans-Dicke system. It can be directly verified that (2.2) satisfies (3.1), (3.2), which is obvious since this $T^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$ came from the satisfaction of the system (2.15)-(2.18). This last $T^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$ which arises from the limiting process of the matter theory defines probably the most interesting vacuum theory.

It is interesting to construct under some prescription consistent non-trivial systems for $g_{\mu\nu}, \phi$ as above with simple equations of motion for $\phi$, for example $\Box\phi = 0$, or some modification $\Box\phi = V'(\phi)$ with $V = \frac{1}{2}m^2\phi^2$ or $V$ a potential analogous to the one of the Higgs field of particle physics. Starting on the contrary with an arbitrary energy-momentum tensor $T^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$ of $\phi$ on the right hand side of $G^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$, will give through the Bianchi identities the equation of motion for $\phi$ which will in general be complicated. Another option is to assume actions, but still there, the equations of motion for the scalar field are in general complicated.

In the context of scalar-tensor gravity, it has been constructed [14] the most general theory with second-order equations of motion which arise from action (see also [15]). The role of the action is crucial in that it provides an unexpected relation [16] between the scalar field equation of motion and the divergence of the gravitational equations, thus the scalar equation is a consequence of the gravity equations. Here, the field equations do not arise demanding an action and the scalar equation of motion does not obey necessarily such a relation. Therefore, it is to be seen if a Lagrangian can be constructed to describe the theories presented here. Even in this case, these theories will provide particular sectors of the full Horndeski family.

One way to obtain solutions of the system (3.1), (3.2) is to assure that $(\phi^{-1}T^{\mu}{}_{\nu})_{;\mu}$ vanishes identically requiring stronger conditions, i.e. demanding that all coefficients of (2.13) vanish. The arising system of equations consists again of (2.15)-(2.18) with the difference that the $\lambda$ term in (2.16) is now absent. This absence makes the situation quite different: an equation of the system is redundant. Following similar steps as before for integrating the new system of equations, we obtain $E = -C$, $X = -\frac{6\pi}{\phi}C^2$, $Y = 2C' - \frac{2\pi}{\phi}C^2 - \frac{2}{\phi}C$, from where the following energy-momentum comes up

$$T^{\mu}{}_{\nu} = \Big(C' - \frac{4\pi}{\phi}C^2 - \frac{1}{\phi}C\Big)\phi^{;\mu}\phi_{;\nu} - \Big(C' + \frac{2\pi}{\phi}C^2 - \frac{1}{\phi}C\Big)\delta^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\phi^{;\rho}\phi_{;\rho} + C\big(\phi^{;\mu}{}_{;\nu} - \delta^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\Box\phi\big)\,. \tag{3.3}$$

This energy-momentum tensor contains one arbitrary function $C(\phi)$ in an explicit form, and (2.2) does not in general belong in this class. The main characteristic of (3.3) is that the corresponding gravitational equation $G^{\mu}{}_{\nu} = 8\pi\phi^{-1}T^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$ can be supplemented by any field equation for $\phi$ (containing $\phi, g_{\mu\nu}$), since no such equation has been used in the derivation. To see the limits of (3.3), setting $C = \frac{1}{8\pi}$, we get the -questionable due to (2.7)- $\lambda \to \infty$ (or $\omega = \frac{2-3\lambda}{2\lambda} = -\frac{3}{2}$) limit of Brans-Dicke equation (2.6). This limit also arises from the less efficient equation (2.30) vanishing the various coefficients and it can be accompanied by any equation of motion for $\phi$.

To show an interesting case of (3.3), choosing

$$C = \frac{\phi}{\sigma + 8\pi\phi}\,, \tag{3.4}$$

where $\sigma$ is an arbitrary parameter, we obtain

$$T^{\mu}{}_{\nu} = -\frac{12\pi\phi}{(\sigma+8\pi\phi)^2}\Big(\phi^{;\mu}\phi_{;\nu} - \frac{1}{2}\delta^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\phi^{;\rho}\phi_{;\rho}\Big) + \frac{\phi}{\sigma+8\pi\phi}\big(\phi^{;\mu}{}_{;\nu} - \delta^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\Box\phi\big)\,. \tag{3.5}$$

Actually the above $C$ in (3.4) is the only choice in order to form the combination $\phi^{;\mu}\phi_{;\nu} - \frac{1}{2}\delta^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\phi^{;\rho}\phi_{;\rho}$, and therefore $\sigma$ appears as an integration constant. Setting $\sigma = 0$ in (3.5), once again we get the $\omega = -\frac{3}{2}$ Brans-Dicke theory. Thus, already the specific theory defined by (3.5), together e.g. with $\Box\phi = 0$, forms an interesting vacuum generalized Brans-Dicke theory (although it can also be equipped by other equations of motion for $\phi$). Defining $\varphi = \phi + \frac{\sigma}{8\pi}$, equation (3.5) gets the form

$$T^{\mu}{}_{\nu} = -\frac{3}{16\pi\varphi}\Big(1 - \frac{\sigma}{8\pi\varphi}\Big)\Big(\varphi^{;\mu}\varphi_{;\nu} - \frac{1}{2}\delta^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\varphi^{;\rho}\varphi_{;\rho}\Big) + \frac{1}{8\pi}\Big(1 - \frac{\sigma}{8\pi\varphi}\Big)\big(\varphi^{;\mu}{}_{;\nu} - \delta^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\Box\varphi\big)\,. \tag{3.6}$$

We close with a remark in relation to equation (3.3). While the energy-momentum tensor (3.3) contains an arbitrary function, in the same context, assuming an extra varying cosmological constant, a unique theory arises [17] whose energy-momentum tensor consists of the $\omega = -\frac{3}{2}$ Brans-Dicke $T^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$ with the addition of the term $-\frac{\phi^2}{8\pi}\delta^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$ (in [17], $T^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$ was expressed in terms of $\psi = \ln(\phi/\bar{\Lambda})$). This is due to that an extra term of the form $F(\phi)\phi_{;\nu}$ appears in (2.13). Therefore, a varying cosmological constant extracts a single vacuum theory instead of an infinity of theories here, and moreover, this theory is an improvement of the $\lambda \to \infty$ Brans-Dicke theory. The fact that both $T^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$, the $\omega = -\frac{3}{2}$ Brans-Dicke and the one in [17], are covariantly conserved is possible since these conservations occur on-shell and the Einstein equations are different in the two cases.

## IV. CONCLUSIONS

In the presence of matter with energy-momentum tensor $\mathcal{T}^{\mu}_{\ \nu}$ beyond a scalar field $\phi$ whose equation of motion is $\Box\phi = 4\pi\lambda\mathcal{T}$, it is found the most general consistent energy-momentum tensor for $\phi$ with two derivatives in its term. At the same time, the energy conservation of $\mathcal{T}^{\mu}_{\ \nu}$ is violated due to the presence of $\phi$. This theory, (2.1)-(2.4), reduces to the standard Brans-Dicke theory (2.5)-(2.8) for a suitable choice of the new parameter $\nu$ appearing.

In the absence of extra matter other than $\phi$, the complete family of vacuum theories (2.1), (2.11) obeying (3.1), (3.2) is found, which is consistent with the free wave equation for $\phi$. The unique vacuum theory that arises from the limiting process of the complete matter theory belongs in this family. The subclass of theories with identically covariantly conserved energy-momentum tensors is also found (equation (3.3), or (3.5) for an interesting example), they are parametrized by a single function of $\phi$, and thus, these theories can be supplemented by any equation of motion for the scalar field.

It would be interesting to study the cosmology and the black hole solutions of the above theories, to investigate the stability issues, or to confront with the solar system bounds and restrict the parameters $\nu$, $\omega$.

### Acknowledgments

I wish to thank Alex Kehagias for useful discussions.

[1] C. Brans and R. H. Dicke, Phys. Rev. **124**, 925 (1961).
[2] L. L. Smalley, Phys. Rev. D **9**, 1635 (1974); O. Bertolami and P. J. Martins, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 064007 (2000) [gr-qc/9910056]; S. Das and N. Banerjee, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 043512 (2008) [arXiv:0803.3936 [gr-qc]]; W. Chakraborty and U. Debnath, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **48**, 232 (2009) [arXiv:0807.1776 [gr-qc]]; J. c. Hwang, Phys. Rev. D **53**, 762 (1996) [gr-qc/9509044].
[3] T. Clifton and J. D. Barrow, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 104022 (2006) [gr-qc/0603116].
[4] W. Zimdahl, AIP Conf. Proc. **1471**, 51 (2012) [arXiv:1204.5892 [astro-ph.CO]]; G. Olivares, F. Atrio-Barandela and D. Pavon, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 063523 (2005) [astro-ph/0503242]; S. del Campo, R. Herrera and D. Pavon, JCAP **0901**, 020 (2009) [arXiv:0812.2210 [gr-qc]]; D. R. K. Reddy and R. Santhi Kumar, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **52**, 1362 (2013).
[5] J. D. Barrow, Nucl. Phys. B **310**, 743 (1988); L. P. Chimento, A. S. Jakubi and D. Pavon, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **9**, 43 (2000) [gr-qc/9911097]; J. D. Barrow, D. Kimberly and J. Magueijo, Class. Quant. Grav. **21**, 4289 (2004) [astro-ph/0406369]; K. Freese, F. C. Adams, J. A. Frieman and E. Mottola, Nucl. Phys. B **287**, 797 (1987).
[6] B. Geyer, S. D. Odintsov and S. Zerbini, Phys. Lett. B **460**, 58 (1999) [gr-qc/9905073]; S. Das and N. Banerjee, Gen. Rel. Grav. **38**, 785 (2006) [gr-qc/0507115]; B. Guberina, R. Horvat and H. Nikolic, Phys. Lett. B **636**, 80 (2006) [astro-ph/0601598].
[7] Y. M. Cho, Class. Quant. Grav. **14**, 2963 (1997); Y. Fujii, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **9**, 3685 (1994) [gr-qc/9411068].
[8] J. Khoury and A. Weltman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 171104 (2004) [astro-ph/0309300]; J. Khoury and A. Weltman, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 044026 (2004) [astro-ph/0309411].
[9] A. I. Vainshtein, Phys. Lett. B **39**, 393 (1972); A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, JCAP **1007**, 024 (2010) [arXiv:1005.0868 [astro-ph.CO]].
[10] C. Romero and A. Barros, Phys. Lett. A **173**, 243 (1993); F. M. Paiva and C. Romero, Gen. Rel. Grav. **25**, 1305 (1993) [gr-qc/9304030]; N. Banerjee and S. Sen, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 1334 (1997); V. Faraoni, Phys. Lett. A **245**, 26 (1998) [gr-qc/9805057]; B. Chauvineau, Class. Quant. Grav. **20**, 2617 (2003).
[11] S. Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology: Principles and Applications of the General Theory of Relativity*, John Wiley and Sons, Inc. (1972).
[12] M. N. Mahanta and D. R. K. Reddy, J. Math. Phys. **12**, 929 (1971); H. A. Buchdahl, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **6**, 407 (1972); J. O' Hanlon and B. O. J. Tupper, Nuovo Cim. B **7**, 305 (1972); D. R. K. Reddy, J. Phys. A **10**, 55 (1977); N. V. D. Bergh, Gen. Rel. Grav. **12**, no. 10, 863 (1980); T. M. Karade and P. U. Tore, Acta Phys. Hung. **50**, 77 (1981); V. G. Bagrov and V. V. Obukhov, Russ. Phys. J. **35**, 70 (1992) [Sov. Phys. J. **35**, 70 (1992)]; X. G. Xiao, B. J. Carr and L. Liu, Gen. Rel. Grav. **28**, 1377 (1996).
[13] L. A. Anchordoqui, A. G. Grunfeld and D. F. Torres, Grav. Cosmol. **4**, 287 (1998) [gr-qc/9707025]; L. O. Pimentel, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **12**, 1865 (1997); S. Chakraborty and A. Baveja, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **16**, 1629 (2001); S. M. Kozyrev, gr-qc/0207039; A. Bhadra and K. Sarkar, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **20**, 1831 (2005) [gr-qc/0503004]; S. Kozyrev, gr-qc/0512020; S. V. Sushkov and S. M. Kozyrev, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 124026 (2011) [arXiv:1109.2273 [gr-qc]]; A. Khaybullina, R. Izmailov, K. K. Nandi and C. Cattani, Adv. High Energy Phys. **2013**, 367029 (2013).
[14] G. W. Horndeski, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **10**, 363 (1974).
[15] C. Deffayet, S. Deser and G. Esposito-Farese, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 064015 (2009) [arXiv:0906.1967 [gr-qc]].
[16] J. C. Du Hessis, Tensor **20**, 347 (1969); G. W. Horndeski and D. Lovelock, Tensor **24**, 79 (1972).
[17] G. Kofinas and V. Zarikas, arXiv:1506.02965 [hep-th].